Day 1 AM – NCADAC August 16

Key Messages

Actions and Important Messages

- Adopted minutes
- Approved Agenda
- Noted the need to reconsider the approach to the Mississippi (a synthetic section on issues in the watershed, or a series of vignettes across chapters, eg Great Plains, Gulf Coast)
- Need to address potential for conflict between technical input teams and author teams re what are the key messages

Important Messages

- Operationalize the connections between networks and working groups – do existing working groups have the capacity to address?
- Managing the interfaces between sectors and regions -- "air traffic control"
- Naming of Chapter Authors must be deliberate and transparent – criteria and process must be well understood
- Need to have cross-talk between working group chairs

Potential Agenda Modifications

- Need to ensure appropriate approach to biophysical regions such as high elevation areas…the Arctic… etc

- More consideration of the private sector as a subject or participant in Assessment – eg IT sector, manufacturing, the role of corporations in adaptation and mitigation

- Ensure that disaster management is appropriately included (sectors, regions or Adapation-Mitigation chapter)

Possible Private Sector Assessments Team?

- Peter Kareiva

- Diana Liverman

- Lindene Patton

- Jan Dell

- David Gustafson

Assignment: identify an appropriate path forward on enhanced private sector component

Day 1 – pm
August 16, 2011

- Concerns expressed about the graphic used to describe the Assessment structure, but overall approval or process with caveats:
  - Need to be clear we are not filtering or reviewing the technical inputs, just documenting them and forwarding to appropriate teams
  - Need to be clear about whether March 1 is a hard deadline, or whether additional (later) documents can be considered in response to comments
  - Possibility of two deadlines, one for tech inputs and one for "other" documents brought in by author teams?

Key comments

- Ensure there is an appropriate place in the outline for the Indicators section
- Clarify that some workgroups actually ARE generating chapters (eg Adaptation/Mitigation and Climate Science), whereas other workgroups and technical input teams are distinct from author chapters
- Need for author teams to meet and get training on standards, peer review, integration (author meeting in early 2012)?

Scope and Timing Issues

- To save time, consider conducting agency review concurrently with NRC show stopper review and/or public review

- Can reduce time requirements by releasing electronically first

- Delivery of scenario information should be on the time line, this is a critical path input

- Need to coordinate the "engagement plan" with the "outreach plan" and start earlier than timeline shows

Scope and Timing Issues

- Can also save time by getting templates for the writing and graphics in place quickly

- Only real "checkpoint" is deciding whether the document is ready for review.

- Political and budget issues are largely out of our control but may significantly derail our timeline

Scope and Timing Issues

- Another way to save time is to get the author teams started earlier
- Need expedited process for adding team members to author group , eg permission from Cochairs and reporting back to NCADAC
- Need clear deadlines for evaluation of our progress and points for adaptive decisionmaking
- Can we save time by descoping or not? Alternative paths forward to be considered by the Executive Secretariat at dinner

Options for consideration by ES

- Maintain current outline, but accelerate author team deployment

- Reduce scope – shorter, more compact report, with components that can't be completed by 2013 due in 2014 and beyond.

- Keep the outline as it is, let it play out, and make adaptive decisions as required, understanding it is possible that we may miss the deadline due to forces beyond our contol

Risk based framing

Uncertainty Guidance